

**Minutes**  
**U.S. Department of Energy's Site Specific Advisory Board Chairs Meeting**  
**August 27-28, 2001**  
**Santa Fe, NM**

The Environmental Management (EM) Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB) Chairs met from August 27-28, 2001, at the Hilton Hotel in Santa Fe, New Mexico. The meeting was hosted by the Northern New Mexico Site Specific Advisory Board (SSAB). Meeting participants included Chairs, Vice Chairs, Co-Chairs, and other SSAB members from across the country. Meeting observers included DOE headquarters staff, site coordinators and contractor support staff. Other attendees included SSAB administrators and support staff. The agenda for the meeting is included as Attachment A. Meeting attendees are included as Attachment B. Board Round Robin reports and all meeting attachments are available upon request @ 1-800-7-EM-DATA, or at [eminfo@cemi.org](mailto:eminfo@cemi.org).

(Note: Some of the meeting attendees participated in an opening reception at the Frederico Vigil's Galeria de Pintor on Sunday, August 26 as well as a tour of Los Alamos National Lab on Wednesday, August 29. The reception and tour are not addressed in this document.)

Topics for discussion were selected based on the results of a survey of the SSAB Chairs. Survey input was then used to develop Round Robin discussion topics, and a template was prepared as a guideline for each SSAB to use when developing its presentation and talking points.

**Monday, August 27, 2001**  
**Welcome and Introduction**

Menice Manzanares (Executive Director for the Northern New Mexico SSAB) and Jim R. Johnston (Northern New Mexico SSAB Chair) opened the meeting by welcoming everyone to Santa Fe.

The Honorable Larry Delgado, Mayor, City of Santa Fe, welcomed meeting participants and applauded the important work carried out by the SSABs. He also encouraged meeting participants to explore Santa Fe and everything the city has to offer.

John Arthur (Deputy Manager, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE), Albuquerque Operations Office) welcomed everyone to Santa Fe. He explained the role of the Los Alamos National Laboratory as a nuclear security research facility and highlighted various challenges that face the Northern New Mexico SSAB. He recognized the important work and challenges faced by the SSABs associated with DOE's Albuquerque Operations Office.

Martha Crosland (Designated Federal Official, DOE's Office of Environmental Management) welcomed everyone and reaffirmed Headquarter's role in providing guidance and policy support for the SSABs. She explained that DOE headquarters principally provides backup to SSAB field activities. On behalf of DOE, she thanked the boards for their hard work.

Toby Lynn Herzlich (the Northern New Mexico SSAB Facilitator) welcomed meeting attendees to Santa Fe. She mentioned that the meeting agenda is well balanced and asked meeting participants what their meeting expectations were. She also asked the SSAB Chairs to address mutual board problems that could possibly be resolved over the next two days. These thoughts and other Board suggestions were addressed over the next two days.

Toby concluded by introducing the meeting agenda, meeting rules and format.

**Discussion of the EM Assessment review being conducted by Jessie Hill Roberson, DOE Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management- Gene Schmitt DOE Headquarters**

Gene Schmitt (Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary for Policy, Planning and Budget, DOE Office of Environmental Management) presented on behalf of Jessie Hill Roberson who could not attend.

Gene provided meeting participants and attendees with the new EM Assistant Secretary's background and highlighted her previous EM work experience. He stated that the Assistant Secretary is presently focused on the EM Assessment, which requires that she limit her travel across the complex.

On behalf of the Assistant Secretary, Gene posed the question, "what can the new EM Assistant Secretary do for the Boards?" Comments and suggestions in response to this question were noted over the following two days.

Gene mentioned that he reviewed some of the SSAB recommendations prior to the meeting and was impressed with their thoroughness and the breadth of the issues they covered.

**Overview of EM Assessment-Gene Schmitt, DOE Headquarters**

Gene Schmitt explained the need for an overall EM program assessment; reasons include increasing life-cycle costs and delays for EM cleanup and remediation activities complex-wide. Gene emphasized that Jessie Hill Roberson will conduct the EM assessment in a manner different than her predecessor, Dr. Carolyn Huntoon, had envisioned. Dr. Carolyn Huntoon (former EM Assistant Secretary) initiated the EM assessment but left office shortly after the assessment process began.

According to Gene, the EM assessment will address the following areas: (1) current EM site cleanup strategies, (2) technical requirements guiding site cleanup, i.e., regulations, site performance metrics and key milestones, (3) site budget requirements FY 2002 and 2003 and (4) site workforce composition.

Initially, the new EM Assistant Secretary will conduct discussions with EM site managers at Headquarters followed by site reviews conducted by onsite technical teams. Upon completion of these onsite reviews, EM's stakeholders will be formally engaged in the review process.

Gene stated that public engagement during the EM assessment would be an ongoing process.

Importantly the Assistant Secretary encourages the SSABs to continue providing timely recommendations to their sites on ways to reduce site life-cycle costs and accelerate site cleanup.

Gene indicated that there is no set timeline for the review process, however site manager discussions should be completed by the end of September.

## **SSAB Response to EM Assessment Presentation**

The new Assistant Secretary, when visiting EM sites, should hold concurrent discussions with the Chair of the local SSAB. Participants of these meetings should include the site manager, the EM Assistant Secretary and the SSAB Chair(s).

The SSAB Chairs expressed that the public needs to be brought in early in the review process.

Chairs mentioned that when the technical teams visit each site they should consult with the local SSAB. The Chairs noted that SSABs possess a deep institutional knowledge of the site and can provide valuable information regarding site activities. Chairs also suggested that it would be beneficial if the Assistant Secretary integrate ongoing site reviews into the EM assessment.

## **SSAB Discussion on Other Issues**

### EM Budget

Gene Schmitt noted that the Assistant Secretary is in the process of creating an integrated site cleanup management system that will provide for the following: linking budgets with strategic site plans and goals, linking performance metrics with budgets, establishing personal appraisals and contractor fee schedules.

Chairs raised their concerns about the lack of public involvement in the development of the EM FY2002 budget. Gene's responded that the FY 2002 budget formulation process represented an anomaly. President Clinton did not develop a legacy budget for his last year in office. Due to delays resulting from the presidential election, the budget formulation process did not allow for full public involvement. Gene stated that the budget formulation process has now returned to normal and the 2003 budget will allow for greater public involvement.

Note: Based on this integrated management system, when project outcomes are in question funding for site cleanup is going to be more difficult to guarantee.

Note: The Chairs suggest that the Assistant Secretary review the affect of unstable budget planning from year to year and recommend that she develop a more manageable, systematic budget formulation process.

### Long-Term Stewardship

The SSAB Chairs emphasized the importance of Long-Term Stewardship considerations when determining specific site closure plans. Gene has not yet spoken to the Assistant Secretary regarding Long-Term Stewardship. Gene stated that another focus area of EM is currently on the technical challenges that need to be addressed before getting to a point where you would address Long-Term Stewardship. Through Board recommendations, Gene suggested that the SSABs could be instrumental in helping define site end-states.

### Expectation of SSABs

The Chairs request clarification from the EM Assistant Secretary as to what the role of the Boards will be under the new Administration. The Chairs also made it clear that they are willing to assist the EM Assistant Secretary on EM issues the Assistant Secretary deems important. Gene Schmitt suggested that the Boards continue to offer timely, substantive recommendations to their site regarding site cleanup and remediation efforts. He also suggested the Boards help define community acceptable end-states for their sites and the processes required to reach these goals.

### SSAB Recommendations

The SSAB Chairs suggested that the Boards' recommendations be considered during the EM assessment. Recommendations provide valuable information regarding site cleanup and closure activities and provide information as to how cleanup activities could be done in a more cost-effective, timely manner. Recommendations also serve as accurate forecasts to events that transpire within the EM program. Therefore, they should be used as predictors of change within the EM program. The Boards also expressed their concern that SSAB recommendations were not being tracked at the national level and request that this is done.

### General Board Comments

The Chairs recommend that additional SSAB Board members serve on the Environmental Management Advisory Board's (EMAB) committees. This would provide other means for the SSABs to influence EM decision-making at the executive level.

The Boards suggest that there should be greater collaboration among the SSABs to provide consensus reports and recommendations to the EM Assistant Secretary on issues of national importance, similar to the Boards recommendation on Long-Term Stewardship.

The Chairs also emphasized that site cleanup and closure plans should be tailored specifically to the site and avoid using a "one size fits all" remediation strategy.

## **Round Robin Report on Current Site Issues and Concerns**

### **Waste Disposition Presentation**

Karen Guevara from DOE's Office of Integration and Disposition provided a presentation on EM Waste Disposition Maps. These maps visually depict waste and material disposition paths, i.e., generation, inventory, treatment, disposal, etc. for each site and waste type. Karen Guevara noted that waste disposition maps are available on the EM website (<http://emi-web.inel.gov/dmaps2000.html>). Karen pointed out that DOE headquarters uses these disposition maps to aid in their internal decision-making processes. Maps are created using information generated by the budget formulation process. Although some of the information is subjective, the process to cultivate and interpret the data is well defined.

### **SSAB Response to Waste Disposition Presentation**

According to the Boards, the primary interest in site disposition maps is their ability to illustrate interdependence of sites as they relate to interconnected waste streams and disposition pathways.

The Chairs are concerned about stopgaps in site waste disposition strategies and the potential future problems they represent (denoted by red and yellow lights in the maps). The Chairs voiced concern that disposition maps are difficult to comprehend and request that DOE site personnel assist the Boards in their interpretation.

The Chairs also expressed they should be cautious when requesting technically complicated information from DOE for non-technical audiences.

The Chairs expressed concern that if inconsistencies in the disposition maps are noted how do they ensure changes to the maps are made and how will the SSABs be informed when changes are made. The Chairs also request that sources be cited in the development of waste disposition maps, i.e., CERCLA documentation etc. The Chairs mentioned that a process for SSAB disposition map review should be established.

Karen suggests that Boards contact DOE site technicians if they note any inconsistencies with the data presented in the disposition maps. Karen mentioned that the Boards could consult DOE site personnel on the interpretation of waste disposition maps as necessary.

### **DOE's Cleanup Budget**

Gene Schmitt provided a presentation on EM's FY 2002 Budget request (Attachment C) that addressed the following points: EM budget priorities and strategies, FY 2002 budget request and recommendations, major EM accomplishments for FY 2000 and 2001 and future planned accomplishments, science and technology and Long-Term Stewardship, and other budget background information.

### **Budget Discussion with the SSABs**

The Chairs expressed their concern over the recent trend in EM flat budgets. According to the SSABs, flat budgets cannot accommodate site plans that involve a transition from EM planning to operation. Necessary capital investment increases as a site cleanup moves from the planning phase to a remediation phase that involves construction of cleanup facilities. Flat budgets do not necessarily address this issue. Gene responded by saying that DOE has to balance many budget priorities when compiling a budget request for the entire Department. DOE fully understands the legal indemnities associated with missed EM milestones and other compliance failures. These concerns are clearly conveyed to Congress by requesting program amounts that maintain compliance. However, Gene mentioned that Congress is not arbitrary in assigning funding to the EM program and will limit funding if site cleanup progress is not maintained.

Gene noted that DOE requested that Congress not provide for additional EM funds upon submittal of the DOE FY 2002 budget. However, indications from Congress suggest that the EM FY 2002 budget will be increased by as much as 700-900 million. These figures will be deliberated and decided upon by the House and Senate in conference.

Gene also mentioned that funds for DOE employees affected by past weapons production activities will be provided by the Department of Labor.

Gene discussed the EM budget formulation process and noted that it starts with DOE field manager's input to Headquarters. Stakeholder groups have an opportunity to provide their input to EM site managers regarding appropriate budget requests until budget figures are submitted to Headquarters. Headquarters operates under the assumption that EM site managers have incorporated public comments into their budget plans upon submission of budget requests to Headquarters.

Gene stated that the EM budget formulation process has now returned to normal and the 2003 budget will allow for greater public involvement.

### **SSAB Input to DOE's Cleanup Budget-Round Robin Report**

#### **SSAB Budget Discussion**

In order to provide meaningful, substantive budget related recommendations to EM site managers, the SSAB Chairs note that it is necessary for Boards to possess a deep understanding of the EM budget process as well as strong Board leadership willing to provide meaningful guidance. The Chairs mentioned that the SSABs relationship with EM site managers determines, in part, the effectiveness SSAB budget recommendations have on site budget requests to Headquarters.

The Chairs expressed their concern over their ability to provide input into reduced finalized budgets that may require realignment of cleanup priorities. However, fixed price contracting at certain sites alleviates this concern due to guaranteed fixed budgets.

The SSABs are concerned about discrepancies in appropriated funds for designated site activities and what the funds are being spent on. They encourage DOE to carefully monitor these variances. The Chairs are also concerned about budget overruns in which all appropriated funds have been spent; yet projected annual goals have not been reached. The Hanford SSAB states that this is a regular occurrence at the Hanford site. The Chairs mentioned that it is the responsibility of the Boards to monitor budget overruns at their sites and develop recommendations to DOE that address this issue.

The Chairs mentioned that there is a difference in Board recommendations related to priorities vs. strictly budget-related recommendations. Some Boards do not get into specific budget numbers but rather make recommendations based on cleanup priorities; other Boards make recommendations incorporating specific budget numbers. Some Boards work closely with their site contractors during budget discussions.

The Chairs also requested clarification and a brief presentation on the function of the EM Environmental Management Advisory Board (EMAB). It was noted that EMAB does not review EM budgets unless it is a priority issue. EMAB functions as a corporate entity that deals with higher level EM policy/management deliberations at the Headquarters level and is focused on the Assistant Secretary's priorities.

Gene also mentioned that he would request that the new Assistant Secretary define and publicly announce her commitment to stakeholder involvement.

### **Public Comment Period**

John Carter-Envirocare of Utah

John began by stating that he appreciates DOE efforts in involving the public in EM decision-making and commends the SSABs on their efforts. John provided a presentation on behalf of his company, Envirocare, a company that provides for low-level waste disposition. Envirocare competes with DOE on the disposition of low-level waste and mentioned the potential advantages to DOE in off-site disposition of the Department's low-level waste. Envirocare also competes for waste streams moving in and out of the Nevada Test Site and Hanford. Envirocare has the capability to manage waste from these sites and can handle 80-90% of waste going to NTS currently. John encouraged the SSABs to investigate offsite disposal options represented by Envirocare.

Richard Gale-Member of Los Alamos SSAB

Richard Gale stated that the Department should view EM cleanup from a corporate perspective, where DOE defines each sites' objective, end-state, prioritizes cleanup initiatives, funds these priorities and provides follow-through on all EM decisions. He mentioned that the SSABs have the ability to sell this corporate model to the public.

**Tuesday, August 28, 2001**

**Review of the First Day, Orientation to Second Day**

Remark by Savannah River that SSABs should stay focused more on local site-specific issues, not on national level issues dealt with at Headquarters. Chairs noted that cooperation among the SSABs is much greater than it was in the past. They mentioned that inter-board information exchange has improved over time as well.

The Chairs expressed concern that there was no public outreach segment built into the meeting agenda and mentioned that all the meeting agenda topics can't be covered adequately in a two-day timeframe. The Chairs suggest DOE extend meeting length to three days to provide enough time to deliberate all outstanding issues. Public outreach issues will be addressed at the end of the day.

The Chairs iterated to DOE the importance of SSAB involvement in all major DOE decisions that meet the Boards' purview. DOE needs to better define the role of SSABs in public involvement. Some Boards are doing different things regarding public outreach and would like DOE to better define this role. The Chairs believe they should have greater discretion in defining their Board's public participation activities. It was mentioned that limited public involvement at public meetings and other Board sponsored events does not necessarily indicate a failure on the Boards part to involve stakeholders, rather it may reflect a limited interest in the issue being presented to the public at large.

**Round Robin-Scope of the SSABs and their Relationships with DOE**

After the Round Robin presentation by the Boards, Fred Butterfield explained the official role of the SSABs as defined by the SSAB Charter and Guidance. He provided this explanation in lieu of confusion expressed by some Chairs over the scope of their boards. Fred explained the SSAB Guidance defines the types of EM issues SSABs may address but leaves much room for interpretation.

**Chairs Discussion on Board Work Scope**

*Rocky Flats*- Expressed trouble getting Board members to participate in Board retreats which are used to define the Board's proceeding work scope. A small core group from the Board usually does the majority of the work.

*Pantex*- The Board is experiencing serious problems over the definition of their work scope. The Board has been operating under a work scope that is not covered by the SSAB Guidance. The Chairs are in the process of trying to convince Board members to realign the Board work scope so that it is in compliance with the SSAB Guidance.

*Hanford*- The Board explained that even though their Board's work scope is well defined some members pursue issues not outlined in the Boards work agenda. This activity reflects a bottom up scope development process as opposed to a top down approach. The Chairs stated that greater buy-in by DOE and the regulators helps fosters a more efficient process when the Board develops items such as its charter.

*Idaho*- In contrast to the process used by the HAB, the INEEL CAB uses a process that is better described as a top down approach. Board members prioritize potential topics for future consideration and the final ranking of topics is used by the facilitator to plan agendas for future

meetings. Topics that are ranked high by the Board as a whole are assigned to committee. Topics that are lower ranking are only put on the agenda on a space-available basis.

*Nevada-* For purposes of clarification, the SSAB Charter is read at Board meetings. At Board meetings, the committee bylaws are reviewed to ensure members stay focused on EM issues related to their topic area.

*Los Alamos-* The Board expressed their concern over DOE's input in setting Board work scopes, whether DOE recommends or sets the annual SSAB agenda. The Board repeatedly questions EM cleanup priorities at Los Alamos and raises questions as to whether cleanup priorities are properly funded. Repeatedly question whether DOE is doing the right thing regarding site cleanup.



*Oak Ridge-* Requests input from DOE to set their annual agenda.

*Savannah River-* The Board feels that DOE site activities that fall outside their purview sometimes forces the Board into a "reactive" state as opposed to a "proactive" state. The Chairs note that some of these issues may eventually be under the Board's review, i.e., the Savannah River MOX Facility, and expressed to DOE that they should be more aware of issues the public may seek their input on, regardless of whether it meets their current work scope. The Board has a standard response that the issue is not under their work scope. The public does not delineate between DOE programs, i.e., DP or EM, therefore, the Boards must be made aware of external EM issues the public may want to discuss during a public meeting.

#### General Comments

The question was raised as to what the SSABs should do when the Boards address topics not spelled out in the SSAB Guidance. Fred Butterfield responded by saying that where the Guidance is not specific, local Boards are free to operate in accordance their own by-laws and operating procedures, providing these do not conflict with the EM SSAB Guidance, the DOE Advisory Committee Management Program Manual, etc- (Of course, any questions concerning applicability or interpretation of the EM SSAB Guidance should be directed to either Martha Crosland or Fred Butterfield.) It helps when DOE management helps delineate topic areas that could be addressed by the SSABs.

Pantex reinforced the fact that DOE must approve the Board's work plan. DOE has the ability to change a Board's works scope. This has created problems for Pantex because the DOE area manager recently disapproved of the Board's work scope.

Hanford includes a DOE glossary that is used in new member packages. The Board finds it useful in educating its membership.

DOE strives to maintain a balance with the Boards from helping define a Board's work scope to assisting in the development of their work plan.

#### **Upcoming Site Specific Advisory Board Workshop**

Draft agenda for upcoming ground water workshop distributed among meeting participants (Attachment D). Doug Sarno, facilitator for the Fernald SSAB, provided a review of the draft ground water workshop meeting agenda. He explained to the SSAB Chairs the historical antecedents that led to the development of such a workshop.

Doug suggested that all recommendations for the groundwater panel discussion be sent to Dawn Haygood at Savannah River by September 15, 2001. Dawn Haygood recorded specific



suggestions on the groundwater workshop meeting agenda. Doug noted that results of the workshop would be submitted to DOE as a series of recommendations, presumably endorsed by all the SSABs.

## **Previous Workshops, Future Workshops**

### Previous Workshops

Martha Crosland, Director of the Department of Energy's Office of Intergovernmental and Public Accountability, provided updates on previous DOE sponsored workshops.

Martha explained that there was no DOE response from the previous low-level waste seminar because there were no official recommendations. DOE responses to other workshops are included (Attachment E).

Martha provided a transportation protocols update and mentioned that the public has provided 500-600 comments on these transportation protocols. Once concurred on by DOE management, these will be institutionalized through DOE order and distributed to stakeholders. No date has been set as to when this may be completed.

Two Long-Term Stewardship seminars with SSAB participation have been held to date, the first in Oak Ridge and another at Rocky Flats. The SSABs developed joint recommendations on Long-Term Stewardship to DOE.

DOE is committed to developing a Long-Term Stewardship Strategic Plan. A steering group comprised of field representatives will manage the development of the Plan. The Plan will be issued in draft sometime in October and finalized in the spring.

Sidenote: National level workshops provide an opportunity for the SSABs to work together on joint recommendations for issues they deem particularly important.

Sidenote: First joint recommendation issued by the Boards was a result of a previous transportation workshop. A cogent statement of stakeholder principles was outlined by the SSABs and sent to DOE. A response letter from Dave Huizenga, DOE Deputy Assistant Secretary for Integration and Disposition, indicated that the DOE agreed with stakeholders.

Sidenote: The Idaho SSAB expressed concern over a recent newsletter published by DOE for the Long-Term Stewardship program. The newsletter stated that DOE planned to get input from stakeholders in the development of long-term stewardship policy and did not acknowledge advice developed by the SSABs at the two workshops addressing long-term stewardship. This omission could be interpreted to mean the Department did not value the advice already developed by the SSABs. Stan Hobson wondered about the value of participating in workshops.

### Future Workshops

Jim Johnston, Chair of the Northern New Mexico SSAB, discussed the upcoming transportation and packaging conference to be held next January in Santa Fe, NM. Workshop presenters will include, representatives from the Department of Transportation, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, legal attorneys familiar with hazardous materials and Nuclear Regulatory Commission headquarters representatives. Information on the workshop will be available on Los Alamo's SSAB website, <http://www.nnmcab.org/>.

#### Proposed Workshop Themes

- Site cleanup progress, cleanup planning, compliance agreements, site realignment
- Long-Term Stewardship and site end-states, i.e., soil action levels and onsite disposal facilities
- Surface water contamination
- High-level waste
- Waste disposition, transuranic waste, high-level waste, off-site waste, scrap metal recycling at Oak Ridge
- SSAB infrastructure, SSAB charter, role of SSAB in public participation
- EM assessment.

Fred Butterfield suggested SSABs host a workshop to develop SSAB recommendations related to accelerated site closure and reduced life-cycle site cleanup costs, *e.g.*, in response to the Assistant Secretary's EM Assessment. These subject areas are of current interest to EM and any joint SSAB recommendations related to these areas would be useful to DOE.

#### Other SSAB Comments

- Chairs proposed DOE headquarters develop an SSAB membership toolkit for new Board members
- Chairs suggested each Board form a committee that addresses the EM Assessment
- Chairs mentioned that a tour of the WIPP facility for the Chairs would enhance the SSABs understanding of DOE waste disposition
- One SSAB Chair suggested that the Boards consider developing an SSAB recommendation that justifies the Board's existence within the scope of the EM assessment
- It was suggested that Boards develop recommendations geared toward accelerated site closure and focus on issue specific recommendations not on the need to justify their existence
- Chairs suggested that it would be beneficial to learn how other Boards conduct meetings by visiting other sites and participating in their Board meetings

*No public comments at this time.*

#### Boards' Top Site Issues

Wendy Lowe, the Idaho SSAB administrator, listed the following common site issues of concern expressed by the SSAB Chairs during yesterday's round robin discussion.

- Ground water/aquifer/surface water contamination
- EM site cleanup budgets- includes providing for site cleanup progress, planning, meeting compliance agreements, alignment, and risk-based decision-making
- Long-Term Stewardship and site cleanup end state, soil action levels and on-site disposal facilities
- Waste disposition including: transuranic, high-level waste, off-site waste and scrap metal
- SSAB Charter, role of the SSABs and public
- EM assessment: SSABs would like DOE to clearly define the process in which SSABs and other stakeholder will be involved in the review process
- Chairs suggested providing Board indoctrination workshops for new members. Workshops could be conducted at the site-level and address topics such as the SSAB Charter and Guidance

## **DOE's Responses to SSAB Recommendations/Advice and Factors that Contribute to SSAB Effectiveness**

### Board Input

*Los Alamos*- Proposed recommendations are read at two consecutive Board meetings and then voted on by the membership.

The Board would like to see a recommendation tracking system implemented by the SSABs. This tool would monitor recommendation responses by DOE and track the status of “open” or “closed” recommendations. The Boards could implement such a tool.

Consensus recommendations involve DOE engagement prior to Board approval. The Board has difficulty in fostering tribal participation.

*Savannah River*- 2/3 majority vote on recommendations necessary.

The Board motion manager guides the recommendation through the approval process. The motion manager (committee chair) reviews and evaluates recommendation responses by DOE. The motion manager evaluates the status of each recommendation and lists them as either open, pending or closed.

The Board continually reemphasizes major site concerns in related recommendations, i.e., ground water.

When developing a recommendation, consideration is given to the level of technical detail provided. The Chairs suggest that there is a correlation between a recommendation not passing and a fundamental misunderstanding of the recommendation itself.

Recommendations include minority viewpoint when submitted to DOE. The recommendation is carefully framed, otherwise Board members may not understand the nature of the recommendation.

Senior board members serve as mentors for new members.

*Rocky Flats*- All recommendations are edited at full Board meetings. The Board is near a point where all recommendations receive a “yes” or “no” answer by DOE due to advanced stage of cleanup process.

DOE values being present during the recommendation approval process. The Department gains greater insight into stakeholder concerns when present during this process.

*Idaho*- When DOE responds to a recommendation, the INEEL CAB asks the committee that originally sponsored it to review the response. (The Board's recommendations must be developed through consensus; administrative decisions do not require consensus.) Sometimes the Committee takes additional action; sometimes no further action is necessary.

The Board does not request recommendation input from DOE.

Committee work is typically done by conference call as members are from throughout the State of Idaho and getting together is prohibitive.



*Nevada-* Majority vote structure for recommendations. The Nevada SSAB has a unique method to generate recommendation consensus. The Board asks the majority opinion to write the minority viewpoint and vice-versa. This process enables Board members to look at opposing perspectives and gain greater insight as to varying concerns over the issue addressed. No independent minority report created, rather opposing viewpoints are built into the recommendations. Recommendations indicate the number of Board members in favor and against the recommendation.

*Hanford-* Recommendations are consensus driven. The Hanford Board relies on recommendation education and good faith initiatives with the Board's membership to achieve consensus.

The Chairs mentioned that strong meeting facilitation is important in generating recommendation consensus. If the Board does not reach consensus on a recommendation, Board members are allowed to speak during the meeting for three minutes to explain their objections to the recommendation.

The Hanford SSAB is unique in that it is an "interest" oriented board as opposed to an "individual" oriented board, meaning seats are typically filled by representatives of organizations concerned about site cleanup issues.

The Board will, at times, use its relationship with regulators as leverage with DOE in the development of recommendations DOE may not be in agreement with. Regulator support helps ensure DOE responds to recommendations in a timely manner.

*Pantex-* Consensus is required for passing Board recommendations and changing bylaws. Board is organized under a caucus structure. Limited recommendation understanding creates a lack of consensus. Education is key.

Board bylaws are strictly defined, little room for interpretation, makes it more difficult for the Board to operate.

*Paducah-* While voting on recommendations, the Board attempts to reach consensus. If it cannot reach consensus it will proceed to a majority vote.

*Oak Ridge-* Majority based recommendation approval process.

#### Other Comments

- Certain Boards require a quorum before they proceed with Board issues, i.e., voting on recommendations. More problems regarding quorums are incurred during committee deliberations over recommendations.

The SSABs occasionally write recommendations that DOE disagrees with.

- Recommendation consensus is usually reached by the Boards, although it varies as to the amount of effort necessary to reach consensus.

- Some Boards work with DOE during the draft phase of recommendation development, other Boards do not.

- Questions were raised regarding the methods used by Boards in tracking recommendations.

- Educating board members on the details of recommendations is key to guaranteeing consensus
- DOE serves as a useful sounding board in the development of board recommendations. Promotes the ability to find common ground on a particularly contentious issue.
- Some Boards have/are considering student board membership.

### **Public Comments**

Diane Hallola- Isleta Pueblo, and member of the former Sandia SSAB. Diane will recommend to the all-Indian Pueblo Council that tribal participation with SSABs should be increased. Diane expressed her appreciation for all the Boards efforts.

June Fabryka- June suggests the Boards develop an annual report card that would grade DOE on its cleanup initiatives as well as other pertinent DOE activities, i.e., public outreach. Factors that could be measured include: public participation, ground water, air quality management, DOE responsiveness to the SSAB. Please email June if interested in developing this tool.

Jim Brannon- Jim spoke in favor of the creation of a WIPP SSAB.

### SSAB Chairs Meeting Wrap-up

-Fernald offered to host the next SSAB Chairs meeting.

-Martha Crosland has agreed to keep the Boards informed concerning the status of the EM assessment.

### What worked well in the Meeting

- Concise presentations by Boards, round robins create order.
- Room layout
- Development of the meeting agenda
- Scripted round robin's help focus the Boards during their presentations and discussions

### How can the meeting be improved

- Some Chairs suggested that SSAB Chairs meetings should be extended to allow for discussion on the most important board issues.

- Chairs request more guidance from DOE when they are presented with technically challenging information. For example, the waste disposition maps presentation was highly detailed and the Boards are unsure as to how they can utilize such technically challenging information. One suggestion was that DOE simplify the information being presented to a level of detail a non-technical individual can grasp.

- The audience needs to be engaged to a greater extent in meeting discussions.

- Simplify templates for ease of understanding.

- Board specific problems need to be addressed in greater detail during these meetings, i.e., Pantex

### Wrap-up

Assistant Secretary Jessie Roberson's responses to issues raised by the SSAB Chairs during the meeting are included as Attachment F.

Jim Johnston of the Los Alamos SSAB thanked the Los Alamos Board for hosting the meeting, meeting sponsors and Headquarters staff.

A brief EMAB discussion was held at the end of the meeting.